UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
24th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 11 November 1993
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 24th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. von WAGNER (Germany)

CONTENTS

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of the publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/48/SR.24
13 January 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: SPANISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AGENDA ITEMS (continued) (A/C.1/48/L.1, L.2/Rev.1, L.12, L.14, L.18, L.20, L.29, L.32, L.42, L.43/Rev.1, L.48)

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42

1. Mr. LEAHY (United States of America), introducing the draft resolution entitled "Moratorium on the export of anti-personnel land mines" under agenda item 71, said that he had seen the terrible effects of land mines in many countries and had therefore decided to combat that scourge. Today, over 85 million of those weapons were strewn in more than 60 countries and they had caused a medical, social, economic and environmental crisis of global proportions. In Afghanistan, there were 10 million mines and whole areas of the country were uninhabitable. In Angola there were 9 million mines and in Cambodia 5 million. Both countries had over 20,000 amputees. In Cambodia, where as many as 300 people each month were being killed or maimed by land mines, 1 out of every 236 people had lost a leg or an arm. The proliferation of land mines had tragic consequences long after a conflict had ended and their economic consequences were devastating for the developing nations.

2. In the past land mines had been used only to impede an enemy's advance in times of war and careful records had been kept of where they had been placed. Today, they were being used as weapons of terror. Moreover, they were inexpensive and easy to manufacture: they cost about $3 while in Cambodia the cost of removing one land mine was $1,000. It would cost billions of dollars to get rid of the mines in that one country alone.

3. In 1992, he had sponsored legislation in the United States Congress for a one-year moratorium on United States exports of anti-personnel land mines, and, two months ago, the United States Senate had voted unanimously to extend the moratorium for three additional years. However, a moratorium by one nation was not a solution. The goal of the United States moratorium was to act as a catalyst for concerted international action to ensure that the mines removed were not replaced with new ones. The international export moratorium called for in the resolution was an important first step. The United States also supported efforts to strengthen Protocol II of the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects. The United States likewise supported the European Community's initiative, which had recently been endorsed by the General Assembly, calling for a report on the feasibility of creating a trust fund for demining. The United States appreciated the support of the 46 States that had co-sponsored the draft resolution and hoped that others would join as co-sponsors.

4. Mr. ROTH (Sweden), speaking on behalf of his country, Canada and the Netherlands, supported the draft resolution and said that the three countries believed that it would be advisable to look into the issue of compliance with a moratorium through appropriate verification measures. They also believed that the United States initiative could support the important task of strengthening the 1980 Convention on excessively injurious weapons. The forthcoming review

(Mr. Roth, Sweden)

conference on that Convention would provide an important opportunity to strengthen the law relating to the use of land mines. An agreement on a moratorium on the export of land mines that posed grave danger to the civilian population would be a valuable complement to those efforts.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48

5. Mr. YASSIN (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, introduced the draft resolution entitled "Israeli nuclear armament" under agenda item 74. Although the United Nations had adopted a number of resolutions on that question, the draft resolution took into account some recent changes in the international situation.

6. In the First Committee, the States politically close to Israel had said that the Non-Proliferation Treaty represented a legal and political guarantee of non-proliferation and peace. They had also said that the extension of the Treaty in 1995 could provide a basis for general disarmament. Israel's allies had asked for regional measures to prohibit the reduction of nuclear weapons and the sale of fissionable material in the Middle East.

7. The draft resolution referred to the positive aspects of the peace negotiations between the Palestine Liberation Organization and Israel. However, the building of confidence through those negotiations required additional steps. It was necessary to establish a nuclear-free-zone in the Middle East; to attain that goal Israel should renounce nuclear weapons and accede to the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Moreover, like all the States of the region, it should submit its nuclear installations to IAEA safeguards. The Group of Arab States hoped that the draft resolution would be supported by the international community.

8. Mr. YATIV (Israel) said that his country could not accept draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48 entitled "Israeli nuclear armament" in any of its versions and considered that it should not have been included in the First Committee's agenda. In 1993 more than ever that stale ritual cast doubt not only on the sincerity of the efforts of the United Nations but also on its stance with regard to the ongoing peace process. The purpose of that process was to find solutions to bilateral and regional problems and among the multilateral problems under consideration were those of regional security and arms control. Regional and extraregional parties, including representatives of the United Nations, were taking part in the multilateral talks.

9. The peace process deserved encouragement from all parties. Consequently, biased General Assembly resolutions would contribute nothing. At its thirty-sixth General Conference, the International Atomic Energy Agency had decided to discontinue further reference to a similar resolution on Israeli nuclear capabilities and threats. In Israel's opinion, the United Nations should follow the example of the General Conference of the IAEA.

10. Moreover, the draft resolution also ignored the advice of the Secretary-General in paragraph 7 of his report (A/48/399) of 25 October 1993 that the factors affecting security should be dealt with simultaneously. It also ignored the conclusion reached by the Secretary-General in paragraph 22 of that report

(Mr. Yativ, Israel)

that a nuclear-weapon-free zone could not be conceived of or implemented in a political vacuum, separate from the process of mutual reconciliation. Israel invited the Committee to heed that advice. Only in the peace talks were all those elements being taken up, and any attempt by the United Nations to separate the nuclear issue from the peace process could only be detrimental.

11. The operative paragraphs of the draft resolution formed part of the resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. Although the latter resolution contained elements unacceptable to Israel, it had none the less joined the consensus over the years since it identified with the goal.

12. Israel hoped that the United Nations would cease to single it out for censure, explicit or implicit, for if the Organization supported the peace process it could not at the same time interfere by adopting resolutions on isolated issues; and it trusted that Member States would realize their responsibility and vote against the resolution under consideration. Their vote would demonstrate whether equity rather than convenience alone governed the First Committee's deliberations.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.12

13. Mr. PELAEZ (Argentina) introduced the draft resolution entitled "Study on the application of confidence-building measures in outer space" under agenda item 70. Argentina believed that confidence-building measures were one of the cornerstones of stability and security in outer space and a good example of preventive action in the space field, and that they could help avoid an armed race in space. The 1993 study on the application of confidence-building measures in outer space (A/48/305) had been submitted at the request of the General Assembly in resolution 45/55 B. As Chairman of the Group of Governmental Experts who had undertaken the study and on behalf of his delegation, he expressed the hope that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32

14. Mr. SCHERBAK (Russian Federation) introduced, on behalf of the sponsors, the draft resolution entitled "Maintenance of international security" under agenda item 80. With the end of the cold war and bipolar confrontation, the United Nations must seek new approaches to resolve international security issues. Underlying the dialogue on the issue there must be a constructive spirit seeking to harmonize the proposals of Member States for strengthening the role of the United Nations and of the international agencies in the establishment of peace. The more decisive, dynamic and flexible the specific action taken by the United Nations under the Charter to contain the threats to international peace and stability, the sooner would the Organization become an effective instrument for the establishment of peace. The sponsors of the draft resolution, promoted by a desire to narrow the gap between the positions of various countries, had sought to take into account the wishes of a great many delegations, and hoped that the draft resolution would receive broad support.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.43/Rev.1

15. Mr. FOUATHIA (Algeria) introduced the draft resolution entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region" under agenda item 77, on behalf not only of the traditional sponsors - Albania, Cyprus, Egypt, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Morocco and Tunisia, together with Algeria - but also, for the first time, of the five Mediterranean countries in the European Community: France, Greece, Italy, Portugal and Spain. The sponsors were convinced of the value of dialogue, coordination and cooperation in developing a spirit of association that would foster the establishment of a shared stability and prosperity in the Mediterranean region, in a lasting form.

16. To a greater degree than the resolutions previously adopted on the question, the draft resolution dealt with a broad range of relevant issues, having to do not only with security but also with cooperation of various kinds. Its aim was to give new impetus to the dynamics of the relations between Mediterranean countries in order to foster a climate of confidence. The sponsors had sought to take into account the positive changes that had occurred in the region; consequently, the text took note again of all previous initiatives, above all by the Mediterranean countries themselves, to strengthen peace, security and cooperation in the region, while at the same time reaffirming the primary responsibility that rested with the Mediterranean countries. Given the positive spirit that had prevailed during the drafting of the text, the sponsors trusted that it would be adopted without a vote.

Adoption of decisions on the draft resolutions under agenda items 57 to 75 and 77 to 82 (A/C.1/48/L.1, L.2/Rev.1, L.12, L.14, L.18, L.20 and L.29)

17. Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee) informed the Committee that Ireland, Malaysia, Russian Federation and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.1; Canada, Denmark, Haiti, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, Panama, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the United States of America, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.2/Rev.1; the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.3; Algeria, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.5; the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.7/Rev.1; Japan, Sweden and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.8/Rev.1; Albania and Panama, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.11; Panama and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.14; the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.16; Albania, Cape Verde, Haiti, Lithuania and Panama, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.18; Panama, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.22; the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.24; Kenya and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.27; Latvia, Lithuania, Panama and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.28; Panama, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.29; Austria, Panama and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.30; Panama, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.32; Luxembourg, Panama and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.33; Lithuania, Luxembourg and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.34; Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkmenistan, those of draft resolution

(Mr. Kheradi)

A/C.1/48/L.36; Panama, those of draft resolutions A/C.1/48/L.37 and A/C.1/48/L.38; Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Maldives, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mozambique, Saint Lucia, San Marino, Sao Tomé and Principe, Sudan, Tajikistan, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan and Zaire, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.40; Cameroon, Latvia, Panama and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.42; Croatia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.43; Cameroon, Latvia, Luxembourg and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.44/Rev.1; Panama and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.45; Latvia, Lithuania, Panama and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.47; and Egypt, those of draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.48.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.1

18. The CHAIRMAN said that he took it the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.1 on education and information for disarmament without a vote, as the sponsors had requested.

19. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.1 was adopted without a vote.

20. Mr. MADDEN (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position after the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.1, said that because of the positive spirit and motivation of the sponsors, the United States had decided to join the consensus. Nevertheless, if the draft resolution had been put to a vote, his delegation would have abstained because of reservations on the language used in several of the paragraphs. The United States disagreed with the concept that it was appropriate for States to implement programmes intended to mobilize world public opinion or that it was considered suitable for States or international organizations to dictate educational content. Also, it took issue with the inference that one of the Member States' preoccupations ought to be publicizing the Final Document of the first special session devoted to disarmament.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.14

21. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.14 entitled "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services programme" without a vote, as the sponsors had requested.

22. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.14 was adopted without a vote.

23. Mr. TANAKA (Japan), explaining his delegation's position on the resolution, said that it welcomed the consensus on the need to promote expertise in disarmament among public officials, particularly in the developing countries. The objectives of the fellowship programme had been achieved with the help of the peoples and countries which had supported it. Japan was pleased to have been a host country. Over the past decade hundreds of fellows had visited

(Mr. Tanaka, Japan)

Hiroshima and Nagasaki, two cities whose experience had shaped Japan's disarmament policy. The Japanese Government assured the Committee that it was willing to continue to cooperate in the programme.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.20

24. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.20 entitled "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme" without a vote, as the sponsors had requested.

25. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.20 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.29

26. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.29 entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific and United Nations Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean" without a vote, as the sponsors had requested.

27. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.29 was adopted without a vote.

28. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran), explaining his delegation's position on the resolution, said that Iran attached great importance to the work of the United Nations peace and disarmament centres, in particular the one in Asia; if the Asian Centre was to be effective, it would have to give due attention to all the subregions and have the support of all countries.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.12

29. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.12 entitled "Study on the application of confidence-building measures in outer space" without a vote, as the sponsors had requested.

30. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.12 was adopted without a vote.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.2/Rev.1

31. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.2/Rev.1 entitled "Transparency of military expenditures" without a vote, as the sponsors had requested.

32. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.2/Rev.1 was adopted without a vote.

33. Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan), explaining his delegation's position, said that although Pakistan supported the ultimate objective of the resolution it had reservations about its one-dimensional purpose, and that greater transparency would not by itself result in significant reductions of military budgets and

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

might not even be possible unless the causes of discord and tension were first removed.

34. Furthermore, it was not right to evaluate defence expenditures in GNP terms, for military imbalances were not caused by defence expenditures in themselves but by the relative proportion of the men and weapons deployed by each party - the principle on which the negotiations on the reduction of conventional forces in Europe had been based. The reduction of military budgets by specified percentages and according to arbitrary criteria was likely to perpetuate or even aggravate the existing imbalances and would not help to achieve the objective of greater security for all States at the lowest possible level of armaments.

35. Mr. SHOUKRY (Egypt), explaining his delegation's position on the resolution, said that although Egypt had joined in the consensus it believed that the United Nations system for the standardized reporting of military expenditures was of very limited value in its present form; therefore, if the resolution had been put to a vote Egypt would have abstained.

36. Mr. FOUATHIA (Algeria), explaining his delegation's position on the resolution, said that although it had been approved by consensus the Algerian delegation did not agree with the reasoning behind the resolution and believed that it lacked balance.

37. Mr. HU Xiaodi (China), explaining his delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.2/Rev.1, said that, had the draft been put to a vote, China would not have voted, since measures relating to the transparency of military expenditures should take into account the differences between countries and regions in security matters and, furthermore, should be carried out voluntarily. As the draft resolution did not include that principle, China wished to express its reservations.

Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.18

38. Mr. HAN Tae Song (Democratic People's Republic of Korea), explaining his delegation's position on draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.18 entitled "Transparency in armaments" before the Committee took a decision, said that despite its reservations and doubts about the credibility and effectiveness of the text his delegation was ready to accept it in a spirit of consensus. The establishment of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms had not helped to halt the export of arms from the industrialized countries to the developing countries or the transfer of sophisticated weapons technology and had seemed to be encouraging the arms race instead of building confidence.

39. The CHAIRMAN said that if there were no objections he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt the draft resolution without a vote, as the sponsors had requested.

40. Draft resolution A/C.1/48/L.18 was adopted without a vote.

41. Mr. HU Xiaodi (China), explaining his delegation's position on the resolution, said that transparency in armaments measures must be practicable and formulated jointly by the countries concerned so that they could choose measures suited to their situations. That principle was crucial for the success of the work of the group of governmental experts which was to meet in 1994, which should give comprehensive consideration to the relevant work done by the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament and to the views of all States.

42. Mr. LEDERMAN (Israel), explaining his delegation's position on the resolution, said that although it had joined in the consensus it did not support the suggested further development of the Register because the existing mechanism must first be given an opportunity to show that it worked. In any event, the decision to develop the Register ought to be taken first at the regional level by consensus, in order to protect the national security of all the parties concerned.

43. Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran), explaining his delegation's position on operative paragraph 3 of the resolution, said that it understood that the terms of reference of the group of governmental experts were those set out in paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L.

44. Mr. FOUATHIA (Algeria), explaining his delegation's position on the resolution, said that it had joined in the consensus in order to enhance the viability of the mechanism. It hoped that the group of governmental experts would conclude its work successfully and would bear in mind the views of all countries, and that the Conference on Disarmament would examine the question in greater depth at its next session.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.